

Evaluating the partition function for systems with long range interactions

Tong Zhou

The James Franck Institute, The University of Chicago, 5640 S. Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637
(February 1, 2008)

We express the partition function for an equilibrium system of interacting particles in the canonical ensemble as a functional integration over the particles' density field. We outline a method to evaluate the partition function by expanding around a saddle point. The saddle point is shown to be the solution of the equivalent mean-field theory. Leading corrections to the mean-field theory takes the form of a Gaussian integral.

PACS numbers: 05.20.Gg 05.70.Ce

The partition function for a system of interacting particles in equilibrium can be written down quite easily. Using it to evaluate physically relevant quantities, however, generally requires aggressive approximations. For example, expansion in powers of the density is only good for short-range interactions and low density [1]. Few approximation schemes are appropriate for strongly interacting systems characterized by long-ranged forces, such as Coulomb interactions and gravitational forces.

The method most often used to address systems with long range interactions is the mean-field theory, in which, for any chosen particle, the effects of all other particles are replaced by a mean-field which is not affected by this particle. Its advantage lies in its simplicity and physical clarity. Due to the long-range nature of the interactions, mean-field theory is often a good approximation. However, its inadequacy is shown in experiments [2–4].

The lack of thermodynamical self-consistency of the mean-field theory was pointed out nearly seventy years ago [5,6]. Efforts were then made to develop rigorous approaches for treating such systems by Onsager [5], Kirkwood [6], and Bogolyubov [1]. These methods, from different mathematical view points, however, all relied on detailed descriptions of the microscopic states. Attempts to treat such systems by finding descriptions involving increasing number of particles are undermined by the notorious closure problem. Consequently these methods failed to make any practical predictions, nor an estimation for the accuracy of the mean-field theory.

Philosophically, the failure of these methods is due to the fact that a system with long range interactions is highly coupled—any part of it is affected by the changes in the whole system—and cannot be described effectively by schemes focusing on local effects. This suggests an approach which treats such a system as a whole. The relevancy of the system as a whole also determines that the detailed local information becomes more and more irrelevant with increasing system sizes, and thus can be replaced for a big system through coarse-graining.

This Letter proposes a new approach based on these considerations. We express the partition function as a functional integration over the particles' density field. The saddle point of this expression turns out to be equivalent

to the mean-field theory. Corrections to the mean-field theory then can be expressed as an expansion around this saddle point.

Let us consider a system with N classical particles, volume V and temperature T . Its partition function in the canonical ensemble is,

$$Z = \frac{1}{h^{3N} N!} \int_V e^{-\beta E} d\Gamma \quad (1)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N!} \left(\frac{2\pi m k T}{h^2} \right)^{\frac{3N}{2}} \int_V e^{-\beta U} d\vec{q}_1 \cdots d\vec{q}_N. \quad (2)$$

where $U(\vec{q}_1 \cdots \vec{q}_N)$ is the potential energy due to external fields or interactions among particles. In the following, we will concentrate on the integral part in the above expression, so let us write,

$$Z_s = \int_V e^{-\beta U} d\vec{q}_1 \cdots d\vec{q}_N. \quad (3)$$

Equation (3) is written in terms of integrations over the particles' positions. We want to instead express Z_s in terms of functional integrations over the particles' density field. To derive such an expression, let us start with the ideal gas—the factor $\exp(-\beta U)$ can be simply inserted into the result later.

For an ideal gas, $Z_s = V^N$. Let us divide V into M cells, with volumes $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_M$. A state $\vec{n}$ is represented by the number of particles in these cells, $\vec{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_M)$. The division must satisfy the condition that there are many particles in each cell, i.e. n_i is big. The probability weight of such a state is denoted by $W(\vec{n})$ and it can be obtained through the following considerations.

$$Z_s = (V_1 + V_2 + \cdots + V_M)^N \quad (4)$$

$$= \sum_{\vec{n}} \frac{N!}{n_1! n_2! \cdots n_M!} V_1^{n_1} V_2^{n_2} \cdots V_M^{n_M} \quad (5)$$

$$\equiv \sum_{\vec{n}} W(\vec{n}), \quad (6)$$

where the $\prime$ above the summation sign indicates that particle number is preserved: $\sum n_i = N$.

We can evaluate Eq. (6) using Stirling's approximation,

$$n_i! = \sqrt{2\pi n_i} n_i^{n_i} e^{-n_i}, \quad (7)$$

because n_i is big. Then

$$W(\vec{n}) = \frac{N!}{\prod (\sqrt{2\pi n_i} n_i^{n_i} e^{-n_i})} \prod_{i=1}^M V_i^{n_i} \quad (8)$$

$$= N! e^N \prod_{i=1}^M (V_i^{n_i} / \sqrt{2\pi n_i}) \exp \left[- \sum n_i \log n_i \right] \quad (9)$$

And we express this in terms of the density $\rho_i = n_i/V_i$ of particles in cell i ,

$$W(\vec{n}) = N! e^N \prod_{i=1}^M (2\pi \rho_i V_i)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left[- \int \rho \log \rho dV \right]. \quad (10)$$

We use this form of $W(\vec{n})$ to evaluate Z_s , and change from summations over different configurations of n_i to integrations over continuous variables n_i ,

$$Z_s = N! e^N \sum_{\vec{n}} \prod_{i=1}^M (2\pi \rho_i V_i)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left[- \int \rho \log \rho dV \right] \quad (11)$$

$$= N! e^N \int' \prod_{i=1}^M \frac{d\rho_i}{\sqrt{2\pi \rho_i/V_i}} \exp \left[- \int \rho \log \rho dV \right] \quad (12)$$

$$\equiv \sqrt{2\pi N} N^N \int' D\rho \exp \left[- \int \rho \log \rho dV \right]. \quad (13)$$

For general cases, we simply insert the factor $e^{-\beta U}$, so

$$Z_s = \sqrt{2\pi N} N^N \int' D\rho e^{-\beta f}, \quad (14)$$

where

$$\int' D\rho \equiv \int' \prod_{i=1}^M \frac{d\rho_i}{\sqrt{2\pi \rho_i/V_i}}, \quad (15)$$

and

$$f \equiv U + kT \int \rho \log \rho dV. \quad (16)$$

Equations (14-16) are the desired expression for Z_s and are the central result of this letter.

When we replace the position variables of the particles with the coarse-grained density distribution, certain information is lost. In particular, U is calculated not for the actual positions of the particles, but instead for the coarse-grained density distribution. For this to be a good approximation, certain quantities such as field potential must not vary appreciably within a cell; each cell is treated as a uniform subsystem. This is an additional condition to the one mentioned above that there

are many particles in each cell. Finding an appropriate division of a macroscopic system which satisfies both conditions only is possible if the range of the interaction is long enough.

To calculate Z_s by using Eq. (14) directly is as difficult as by using Eq. (3). However, the form of Eq. (14) suggests a different approach—first, find the saddle point, i.e. the minimum of f , and then expand around this saddle point.

Let us assume ρ_0 is the density distribution which minimizes f . The corresponding minimum is f_0 . Then,

$$\left. \frac{\delta f}{\delta \rho} \right|_{\rho=\rho_0} = 0. \quad (17)$$

To study the saddle point, let us consider an example of an system of particles with Coulomb interaction, encompassed by a surface Σ with surface charge σ . For simplicity, let us assume all particles carry charge e . Then the interaction potential energy for a configuration ρ of particles is

$$U = \frac{1}{2} \int \rho e \phi dV + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma} \sigma \phi dS, \quad (18)$$

where ϕ is the electric field potential, and is connected to ρ by the Poisson equation,

$$\nabla^2 \phi = -\frac{e\rho}{\epsilon_0}, \quad (19)$$

and to σ at the boundary Σ by,

$$\left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} \right)_{in} - \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} \right)_{out} = \frac{\sigma}{\epsilon_0}, \quad (20)$$

where $\vec{n}$ is the unit vector normal to the surface, and pointing outside the system. So, keeping in mind that $\int \delta \rho dV = 0$,

$$\delta f = \int dV \left[\frac{e}{2} (\rho_0 \delta \phi + \phi_0 \delta \rho) + kT (1 + \log \rho_0) \delta \rho \right] + \int_{\Sigma} \frac{\sigma \delta \phi}{2} dS \quad (21)$$

$$= \int dV (e\phi_0 + kT \log \rho_0) \delta \rho + \int_{\Sigma} dS \left[\frac{\sigma \delta \phi}{2} + \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \phi_0 \delta \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} \right)_{in} - \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \left(\frac{\partial \phi_0}{\partial n} \right)_{in} \delta \phi \right] \quad (22)$$

$$= \int dV (e\phi_0 + kT \log \rho_0) \delta \rho + \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \int_{\Sigma} dS \left[\phi_0 \delta \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} \right)_{out} - \left(\frac{\partial \phi_0}{\partial n} \right)_{out} \delta \phi \right]. \quad (23)$$

The second term in the last expression vanishes because there is no charges outside of the system. Then the vanishing of the first term leads to the Boltzmann distribution,

$$\rho_0 = \rho_0 e^{-\frac{e\phi_0}{kT}}, \quad (24)$$

where the constant ϱ_0 ensures $\int \rho_0 dV = N$. Now, moreover, we find that the saddle point corresponds to the Poisson-Boltzmann (PB) equation,

$$\nabla^2 \phi_0 = -\frac{e\varrho_0}{\epsilon_0} e^{-\frac{e\phi_0}{kT}}. \quad (25)$$

Even though the above example focused on the special case of Coulomb interactions, Eq. (16) is completely general so that the saddle point always correspond to the system's mean-field theory. This is reasonable because physically, when we consider only the optimal density distribution and ignore all fluctuations, we get the mean-field theory. Of course, the mean-field theory, though often a good approximation, is neither complete, nor thermodynamically self-consistent. In particular it ignores fluctuations whose effects we will consider next.

We account for fluctuations by expanding around the saddle point, $\rho = \rho_0 + \delta\rho$. The first-order change in f vanishes, let us write the second order change in f as $\delta^2 f$, and in U as $\delta^2 U$. $\delta^2 f$ is a quadratic functional of $\delta\rho$,

$$\delta^2 f = \delta^2 U + kT \int \frac{(\delta\rho)^2}{2\rho_0} dV, \quad (26)$$

and thus is always positive. For Coulomb and gravitational interactions, there are no higher order corrections to U than $\delta^2 U$.

Now we have, from Eq. (14),

$$Z_s = \sqrt{2\pi N} N^N e^{-\beta f_0} \int' D\rho e^{-\beta \delta^2 f}, \quad (27)$$

where

$$\int' D\rho \equiv \int' \prod_{i=1}^M \frac{d\rho_i}{\sqrt{2\pi\rho_{0i}/V_i}}. \quad (28)$$

In obtaining Eq. (27), we neglect terms to the order of $(\delta\rho)^3$ in comparison to terms to the order of $(\delta\rho)^2$ in the expansion of $\rho \log \rho$, also in (28), we write ρ_{0i} instead of ρ_i in the denominator. Both approximations are justified by the fact that each cell contains many particles. The prime above the integration sign in Eq. (27) indicates that particle number is preserved, $\int \rho dV = N$.

Now we can write,

$$Z_s = Z_0 Z_m, \quad (29)$$

where

$$Z_0 = N^N e^{-\beta f_0}, \quad (30)$$

and

$$Z_m = \sqrt{2\pi N} \int' D\rho e^{-\beta \delta^2 f}. \quad (31)$$

Thus, we separate Z_s into two parts: Z_0 describes the mean-field theory, while Z_m accounts for fluctuations.

For non-interacting particles, $\delta^2 U = 0$ and the Gaussian integral for Z_m gives $Z_m = 1$. The mean field theory is exact for this case, as it should be. However, for interacting particles, Z_m yields a nontrivial modification.

For example, ref. [7] investigates a model colloidal system of a charged sphere surrounded by counter-ions inside a spherical shell, mimicking the Wigner-Seitz cell in a colloidal crystal. The mean-field (PB) theory predicts that the free energy is a monotonically decreasing function of the radius of the shell. However, Z_m contributes a increasing component to the free energy thus leads to a local minimum in the free energy's dependence on the shell's radius. This would imply an effective attraction between like-charge colloidal particles, which was observed in experiments [2,3].

If, instead of charged ions, we have neutral particles which interact with attractive gravitational forces in the above model, the mathematical expressions would be nearly identical except that the interaction is with a different sign. Then immediately we see Z_m would lead to an extra effective *repulsion*. This may be relevant to the observation of anomalous gravitational effects [8].

Let us consider the effects of dividing the system into cells from a different view point. In order to derive Equations (29-31), we need the condition that in each cell there are many particles. Of course, the final results should not depend on the way how we divide the system. Essentially, we are considering the effects of density fluctuations. If we decompose these fluctuations into modes with different wavelengths, then the size of the cell corresponds to a short-wavelength cutoff. When we calculate Eq. (31), there are two contributions: one from $\delta^2 U$ and the other from the integration of $\frac{(\delta\rho)^2}{2\rho_0}$. The latter is totally insensitive to the way the cells are made—if we can ignore $\delta^2 U$, we always get $Z_m = 1$ no matter how we divide the system. For long range interactions, we would indeed expect $\delta^2 U$ to be very insensitive to short wavelength fluctuations. So the final result should be independent of the way the system is divided.

Equations (29-31) remind us of a basic concept: The density distribution is not one of the macroscopic quantities such as temperature and volume which determine the equilibrium state of the system. It cannot be preset, but rather results from an ensemble average. Thus when there are interactions between particles, thermodynamic properties cannot be calculated from a *fixed* optimal density distribution in a self-consistent way. The formalism developed here remedies this deficiency.

The method developed here bears a passing resemblance to the density functional theory (DFT) [9–12] in that both approximations use density as the basic variable. However, DFT calculations typically are based on an optimal density distribution, since the goal is often to calculate a system's ground state. Here, density fluctuations are an essential component as they lead to Eq. (31). For finite temperature, DFT calculations based on one

optimal density distribution cannot be thermodynamically self-consistent for reasons stated above. In that case, the method developed here may be helpful to extend DFT calculations.

Also, Ornstein derived the van der Waals equation in a very similar way [13]. But again, the purpose there was to find the optimal density distribution and no fluctuations were considered.

Netz and Orland recently formulated a field theoretical approach [14] to the same class of problems addressed herein. They obtained the PB equation as a saddle point and calculated corrections by an diagrammatic expansion. This approach is well developed in field theory. However, the convergence of the expansion relies on a small parameter which is usually missing when the interaction is long ranged. Actually, Coalson and Duncan had shown that the subsequent terms in such an expansion are of the same order [15]. The method developed here, on the other hand, exploits the long range of the interactions to coarse grain the system effectively.

This work is motivated by the experimental results showing the inadequacy of the mean-field theory [2,3]. For an application of the method described here to a model colloidal system, see [7]. The author wants to thank David Grier, Susan Coppersmith and Daniel Chung for helpful discussions. This work was supported in part by the MRSEC Program of the NSF under award number #DMR-9400379.

- [1] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics*, 3rd Edition, Part 1, (Pergamon, New York, 1993).
- [2] A. E. Larsen and D. G. Grier, *Nature* 385, 230(1997).
- [3] J. C. Crocker and D. G. Grier, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77, 1897(1996).
- [4] J. C. Neu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82, 1072(1999).
- [5] L. Onsager, *Chem. Revs.* 13, 71(1933).
- [6] J. G. Kirkwood, *Theory of Solutions*, (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1968).
- [7] T. Zhou, S. N. Coppersmith and D. G. Grier, *aps1999apr29_005*.
- [8] E. Fischbach and C. Talmadge, *nature* 356, 207 (1992).
- [9] W. Kohn and P. Vashista "General density functional theory," in *Theory of the Inhomogeneous Electron Gas*, S. Lundqvist and N. H. March, Eds., (Plenum, New York, 1983).
- [10] N. Argaman and G. Makov, *physics/9806013*.
- [11] J. P. Hansen and I. R. McDonald, *Theory of simple liquids*, 2nd edition, (Academic, London, 1986).
- [12] H.T. Davis, *Statistical Mechanics of Phases, Interfaces and Thin Films*, (VCH, New York, 1996)
- [13] L. S. Ornstein, thesis, University of Leiden, 1908.
L. E. Reichl, *A Modern Course in Statistical Physics*, Chapter 9, Section H, (University of Texas Press, 1980).
- [14] R. R. Netz and H. Orland, *Europhys. Lett.* 6, 726 (1999).
- [15] R. D. Coalson and A. Duncan, *J. ChemPhys.* 97, 5653 (1992).